1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE 9 CURTIS SHANE THOMPSON, Case No. 08-cv-1065-JCC-JPD 10 11 ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S Plaintiff, MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION 12 v. 13 JOHN T. HICKS et al., 14 Defendants. 15 16 17 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's "Renew[ed] objections and Motion 18 for Reconsideration and for Notice of Appeal to 9th Cir.," Dkt. No. 21, which the Court 19 construes as a motion for reconsideration regarding its Order dated February 19, 2009. See 20 Dkt. No. 19. After careful consideration of Plaintiff's motion, the governing law, and the 21 balance of the record, the Court ORDERS as follows: 22 Pursuant to Local Rule CR 7(h)(1), motions for reconsideration are disfavored, and will 23 ordinarily be denied unless there is a showing of: (a) manifest error in the prior ruling; or (b) 24 facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to the Court's attention earlier with 25 reasonable diligence. Local Rule CR 7(h)(1); see also Bell Consumers, Inc. v. Lay, 203 F. 26 Supp. 2d 1202, 1210 (W.D. Wash. 2002). Here, Plaintiff has not shown a manifest error in the

ORDER PAGE - 1

been brought to the Court's attention earlier through reasonable diligence. Because Plaintiff has not made either of the showings required by Local Rule CR 7(h)(1), his motion for reconsideration, Dkt. No. 21, is DENIED. The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Order to the Plaintiff, counsel for Defendants, and to the Honorable John C. Coughenour. DATED this 6th day of April, 2009. amer P. Donolane JAMES P. DONOHUE United States Magistrate Judge 

Court's prior ruling, nor has he presented new facts or legal authority which could not have